

P3 comprises a first region complementary to the 3' end of F1 and a second region complementary to the 5' end of said DNA molecule; and

P4 comprises a first region complementary to the 3' end of F2 and a second region complementary to the 3' end of said DNA molecule, wherein a thymidine base immediately precedes said region of complementarity between said fourth primer P4 and said second DNA fragment F2, whereby a transcriptionally active DNA molecule is produced by said PCR amplification.

Kindly add the following new claims:

~~8~~ 9. (New) The method of Claim ~~8~~<sup>7</sup>, wherein F1 is the cytomegalovirus IE promoter.

~~9~~ 10. (New) The method of Claim ~~8~~<sup>7</sup>, wherein said transcriptionally active DNA molecule encodes a therapeutic gene.

~~10~~ 11. (New) The method of Claim ~~8~~<sup>7</sup>, further comprising the step of adding a PNA tail to the 5'-end of P1 and P2 prior to said PCR amplification.

~~11~~ 12. (New) The method of Claim ~~8~~<sup>7</sup>, further comprising the step of adding a PNA clamp to said transcriptionally active DNA molecule after said PCR amplification.

~~12~~ 13. (New) The method of Claim ~~8~~<sup>7</sup>, further comprising the step of adding a PNA molecule via a linker to primers P1 and P2 prior to said PCR amplification.

#### REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed January 9, 2001. The specification has been amended to correct typographical errors. Claim 1 has been cancelled. The Office Action indicated that Claims 7 and 8 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In accordance therewith, Claims 2-8 have been amended with Claims 7 and 8 rewritten in independent form. New Claims 9-13 (which correspond to Claims 2-6) have been added depending from Claim 8. No new matter has been added.

Appl. No. : 09/05,262  
Filed : March 23, 2000

### Response to Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 6 was rejected "as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention." The Office Action states that it is not clear if "PNA molecule via a linker" and "PNA clamp tail" are identical or if the PNA clamp tail is a narrower limitation. Claim 6 has been amended to reflect that the two are considered to be identical.

### Response to Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103

As stated above, Claims 7 and 8 have been amended with all of the other claims depending therefrom. Because each and every claim has limitations that were not included in any of the bases for rejection of the prior claims, Applicants do not specifically respond to those rejections in this Amendment.

### CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that this Amendment puts the application in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney if there remain any questions or concerns.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 2-15-01

By: 

Ned A. Israelsen  
Registration No. 29,655  
Attorney of Record  
620 Newport Center Drive  
Sixteenth Floor  
Newport Beach, CA 92660  
(619) 235-8550